

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## ***The Odyssey of Homer. Book IX., with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by G. M. Edwards, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 1887. 2s. 6d.***

W. W. Merry

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 06 / June 1888, pp 175 - 175  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192728, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00192728](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192728)

### **How to cite this article:**

W. W. Merry (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 175-175 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192728

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

breviter enunciatur ut quasi extra numeros positum non in legitima syllabarum morarumque serie recenseretur.' This extraordinary idea will, one would think, find but few supporters. But Dutch scholars seem still to have something to learn in metrical matters. The adoption of Bentley's unfortunate *πανδύροισι Φαλόντες* in E. 487 may pass, but what is to be said to the suggestion (luckily it is not given in the text) that the original of H. 424 was *ἐνθ' ἄρ' ἔην χαλεπὸν διαγνώμεναι ἄνδρα Φέκαστον*? To return to the argument. The principle of always reading the augmented form might have easily led to the unlawful weak cesura in the third foot, as in A. 4; this has been carefully avoided. But it has sometimes, as in A. 54, led to a strong cesura in the third foot, when the natural rhythm of the hexameter would certainly prefer the weak cesura. Still, though our editors carry it a little too far, it is no doubt more rational to suppose that the augment was the rule and the loss of it the exception, than to put in un-augmented forms on the whimsical theory of Aristarchus that the shorter forms are Ionic. The best to do at present would be to stick to the MSS. and keep theory until some one has collected a few facts to bear on the subject.

It goes without saying that they mark elision of *ι* in the dative plural (*σοῖσ' ἑταροῖσι*, &c.); they also endeavour after Nauck to get rid of all the short forms of this case—unnecessarily. The *-ο* of the gen. sing. is elided freely. For the pronouns they write everywhere *ἡμες*, *ἡμας*, *ἡμῶν*, *ἡμῖν*, *ἡμῶς*, *ἡμέτε*, &c., 'et pro *ἡμῶς*, *ἡμῶν*, quas ad dualem numerum referendas esse formas evicisse nobis videmur, dedimus *ἡμε*, *ἡμέ*,' regarding these forms not as certain but "medela et satis lenis et satis probabilis."

To come to some special points. For *ὑφρ' εἶπω* *passim* they read *ὑφρ' ἔσω*, in H. 277 *σκήπτρ' ἔσχον*, an extremely dubious conjecture, in Z. 285 *φίλον ἦτορ* (*φρέν' ἀπεπνέε* ?), in K. 373 *ἐνέδου*, with which they are naturally discontented; surely *ἐνέδου* is better than this; is it possible that *ἐνέδου* may be right for *ἐνέδου*? In O. 481 they read *ἀμφί* for *ἀμφίς*, but *ἀμφίς* may well here mean "between," in K. 299 *ἔσαν* 'Εκτωρ, in K. 285 *ἔσπεο μ' ὥς*, in O. 166 *πότμον ἐφῆσω*, probably a mere conjecture of Zenodotus, in E. 293 *αἰχμὴ δ' ἐξήλθεν*, which cannot be right, as it makes no approach whatever to accounting for the various readings of antiquity and simply spoils the brilliant *ἐξέλυθεν* of Ahrens.

A clear understanding of what passages are to be considered as interpolated, and what not, must underlie any attempt to re-construct the Homeric text, and here our editors seem generally to agree with the results of modern criticism; they occasionally however lose sight of this, as when they arbitrarily alter 'Ερμεία ἐξήγγειλεν in E. 390 to 'Ερμεία ἤγγειλεν.

If however it is not always possible to applaud the judgment of the editors, it is certainly true that they have done good service in issuing a text which will give the reader a very near approximation to the text of Homer now recognised in theory by almost everyone who has any right to speak on the question, and in their *apparatus criticus* they give him the opportunity of judging for himself. I have pointed out what shortcomings—as I conceive them to be—I could find, because it is a pity that so good an edition should not have been just a little better, and attained the ideal standard of what is possible in our present state of knowledge. My only excuse for venturing to speak with such assurance of the work of far more learned scholars must be the old saying that "lookers on see most of the game." To end with unqualified praise, I have kept to the end the series of references to parallel passages printed in the margin of the text.

Take for illustration the references on the opening of A.: "ε 1 sq. = 1 sq.—2 = T. 2—5-9 = O. 222 sqq.—11<sup>b</sup> sq. = Z. 151 sq.—11 cf. B. 451—12-14 = B. 452 sqq.—16<sup>b</sup> = B. 578." Everyone who has had anything to do with Homer will welcome this new and admirable feature in this edition with gratitude.

ARTHUR FLATT.

**The Odyssey of Homer.** Book IX., with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by G. M. EDWARDS, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 1887. 2s. 6d.

THIS edition of the ninth book of the *Odyssey* 'is intended for use in the higher forms of schools.' A serviceable introduction on Homeric Forms is given, following generally the lines of Mr. Monro's grammar. Mr. Edwards, in his preface, refers to the great use he has made of Van Leeuwen and Da Costa in questions of dialect and accident, and of Cauer and Fick in matters of textual criticism: but with the exception of a note referring to Cauer's treatment of contracted verbs, and a quotation of some lines from Fick's Aeolic version, the effect of these authorities is not very noticeable. The short appendices are of unequal merit: the best are those on the subjunctive and optative moods and the traces of the digamma. Others, such as the appendix on the infinitive, are too slight to be of value. Mr. Edwards' notes want life. More room might have been made for explanations and illustrations by the omission of renderings that must be superfluous for 'the higher forms of schools' in possession of a Greek lexicon: such, for example, as *εἰνσιφύλλον*, 'with shaking leaves'; *ἀμφί*, 'round about,' adverbial; *ἀλλή*, 'court'; *ἔφθιτοι*, 'unfailing'; *περί*, adverbial; *ρίψ*, 'a peak'; *θεσπεσίη*, 'wondrous.' Such a note as (57) '*περ*, a shorter form of "*πέρ*, exceedingly," means "even," seems misleading as stated. As Mr. Edwards says nothing about the scholia, it may be doubted if his schoolboys would understand his note (491) on *πρήσσοντες*, where he writes '*πλήσσοντες* Rhianus, *ρήσσοντες* Bergk.' Among slight misprints may be noted "*Ἄργω*, *χαρίεν*, *σμερδαλέον*, *δ μὲν*, *Πηλῆος*." W. W. MERRY.

**Platonis Crito**, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendix, by J. ADAM, B.A. Cambridge, 1888, 2s. 6d.

**Platonis Crito**, edited with critical notes for schools by M. SCHANZ. B. Tauchnitz. 1888.

**Platonis Krito**, mit deutschen Kommentar von PROF. M. SCHANZ. B. Tauchnitz. 1888.

**Platonis Apologia and Krito**, für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von DR. CHR. CRON, ninth edition, Teubner. 1888. 1 Mk.

MR. ADAM'S *Crito* will confirm the favourable impression produced by his edition of the *Apology*. The Introduction is interesting, the notes useful and scholarlike. In the former we think Mr. Adam has succeeded in showing that the framework of the *Crito* is intentionally copied from the proceedings in a law-court, and that we have in it a new *Apology*, in which it is the State that is the prisoner at the bar, *Crito* the prosecutor and Socrates the judge. We cannot however see any ground for the opinion expressed towards the end of the Introduction, that Socrates would not have dogmatically asserted or even have approved of the doctrine of immortality, and that Plato was therefore not justified in imputing to him the reference to Hades contained in the final chapter of the Dialogue. Apparently Mr. Adam regards Socrates as an old-world Positivist, with whom virtue would have lost its bloom if it were supposed to lead the